

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, February 13, 2003
MAG Office Building
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Bruce Henning, Phoenix, Chairman	Tempe: Julia Bennett for Oliver Ncube
Avondale: Jacinda Denison for Carlos Cabrera, Jr.	*Tolleson: Mark Berrelez
*Chandler: Shereen Sepulveda	*Wickenburg: Tom Candelaria
Gila River Indian Community: Candice Bell	*Maricopa County: Ash Madhok
Gilbert: Bill Hancock	Pinnacle West Capital: Susan Szabo for Barbara Lockwood
Glendale: Norm Gumenik for Michael Hoyt	*Salt River Project: Dan Casiraro
*Goodyear: John Acosta	Solid Waste Association of North America: Mark Powell
Litchfield Park: Luke Gutierrez	*Valley Forward Association: Don Cassano
Mesa: Will Black	*Arizona Department of Commerce: Mitra Khazai
Peoria: Neil Mann for Larry Fudurich	*Arizona Clean and Beautiful: Leandra Lewis
Paradise Valley: Andrew Cooper	*Arizona Chamber of Commerce: David Wallis
Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community: Abel Ramirez for Bobby Ramirez	
Scottsdale: James Livingston for Rick Pence	

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Tammy Shreeve	Applied Economics: Sarah Murley
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Peggy Guichard-Watters	Salt River Landfill: Randy Watkins
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: David Janke	Salt River Landfill: Stu Baker
	Maricopa Association of Governments: Brenda Geisen

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Solid Waste Advisory Committee was conducted on Thursday, February 13, 2003 at 10:00 a.m. Bruce Henning, Chair, City of Phoenix, called the meeting to order.

2. Announcements

Mr. Henning provided an opportunity for members to share announcements with the group. Jacinda Denison, City of Avondale, announced that the City began their new curbside recycling pickup two weeks earlier. Neil Mann, City of Peoria, announced that the City has divided the solid waste and street management responsibilities into separate departments and is seeking a manager for the solid waste department. Mark Powell, Solid Waste Association of North America, and Norm Guminek, City of Glendale, announced that the Glendale Truck Rodeo will be held on March 1, 2003 and applications for the event are being accepted from the cities and towns.

3. Approval of the February 26, 2002 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the draft minutes from the February 26, 2002 meeting. James Livingston, City of Scottsdale, moved and Bill Hancock, Town of Gilbert, seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the February 26, 2002 meeting.

4. Status Update MAG Regional Growing Smarter Implementation Project (GSIP) Solid Waste Technical Report

Chair Henning indicated that agenda item number four was for information and discussion. He indicated that Sarah Murley of Applied Economics, consultant for the project, was present to provide a status update on the Draft Solid Waste Technical Report. He indicated that the draft report had been provided to the Committee for review.

Ms. Murley indicated that the report was prepared as part of the Transportation and Community Systems Preservation Pilot Program. She indicated that the report provides a comprehensive look at future demand and supply needs for landfill capacity in Maricopa County, specifically in years 2000, 2010, 2025, 2040 and build out. She indicated that technical reports have also been prepared for other items such as, economic development, transportation, wastewater treatment, school facilities and affordable housing.

Ms. Murley indicated that the report includes organizational structure of providers, solid waste capacity and generation and net differences, and conclusions. She indicated that information for the report was collected from the MAG member agencies, private haulers, and the MAG Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

Ms. Murley indicated that *MAG Draft 2 Population Projections 2002* were used for the report. She indicated that the highest growth rates for years 2000-2010 would occur in the West Valley. She indicated that years 2010 to 2025 showed that highest growth rates would occur in Buckeye, Goodyear and Queen Creek. During 2025 to 2040, only Gila Bend and unincorporated Maricopa County would experience growth rates greater than 20 percent per year. For years 2040 to build out,

most growth would occur in Gila Bend, Maricopa County and Buckeye, with a growth rate of less than one percent per year in other communities.

Ms. Murley indicated that several recycling assumptions were made. The 2010 recycling scenario assumes that curbside recycling would exist in Avondale, Goodyear, Peoria, and Surprise in addition to existing programs in Chandler, Gilbert, Glendale, Mesa, Phoenix, Tempe and Scottsdale. A recycling rate of 26.2 percent is assumed for year 2000. By year 2040, a recycling rate of 35 percent is assumed for all participating jurisdictions, and the rate is increased to 37.4 percent at build out.

Ms. Murley indicated that a net capacity analysis indicates that a countywide remaining capacity of 125.6 million tons would be anticipated at build out (year 2050) and this would be enough for an additional 21 years. She indicated that the results were largely dependent on recycling rate assumptions and participating jurisdictions.

Ms. Murley indicated that the analysis of transfer station and material recovery facilities was conducted. She indicated results showed that additional transfer capacity would be needed by year 2040 in Gila Bend, Wickenburg, Cave Creek, Carefree, and Avondale, but this could likely be accommodated through shifting of assignment of transfer facilities. For the overall countywide totals, a surplus of capacity was estimated at build out.

Abel Ramirez, Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, inquired what the draft MAG population projection was for overall Maricopa County at build out.

Ms. Murley indicated that an 8.5 million population for the overall county was projected at build out.

Chair Henning inquired whether new technologies such as bioreactor landfill technology had been considered in the analysis.

Ms. Murley indicated that new technologies had not been included, but the draft report could likely be modified to include their potential to impact solid waste management.

Chair Henning indicated that it may be helpful if the report discussed waste in tons rather than in pounds since tons is the measure commonly used in the solid waste industry.

Ms. Murley indicated that comments from the Committee are appreciated and that modifications can be made to the report while it is in draft form.

5. Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Update of Recycling

Chair Henning indicated that agenda item number five was for information and discussion. He introduced Tammy Shreeve and David Janke of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) to provide an update on State recycling activities. Ms. Shreeve indicated that the Arizona Solid Waste Recycling Act specifies that cities, towns and counties shall provide their residents with an opportunity to engage in recycling and waste reduction.

Ms. Shreeve indicated that the main purposes of the ADEQ Recycling Program include assistance with funding opportunities and contracts, public education, technical assistance, and partnering with the Arizona Department of Commerce. She indicated that funding for the program is provided through landfill disposal fees totaling about \$2 million per year. She indicated that, as part of the program, the Arizona Recycling Advisory Committee works with ADEQ to determine what direction the State recycling program should take and to review proposals for funding. The committee is made up of nine members from jurisdictions, counties, waste collection and recycling businesses, and the general public.

Ms. Shreeve indicated recycling roundtables were recently held across the state to determine how ADEQ can assist communities and to provide networking opportunities. She indicated that ADEQ has three funding programs including the Waste Reduction Assistance (WRA), WRA Research & Development, and Waste Reduction Initiative Through Education (WRITE). She indicated that all three programs are releasing Letters of Intent at the same time this year to allow ADEQ to process them all on a fiscal year basis. The WRA funding is for projects that would divert a significant amount of material from the landfill. The WRA Research & Development funding is for conducting analyses on ways to divert material from the landfill. The WRITE funding is for projects that educate Arizona citizens to increase awareness about recycling.

Ms. Shreeve indicated that ADEQ has purchased the licensing rights to the “Recycle Guys” campaign, which is a series of radio and television ads promoting recycling through catchy tunes and animated characters. She indicated that cities and towns may use the campaign for only the cost of changing the tag line. The ads are available in Spanish and in English.

Mr. Janke indicated that the ADEQ Recycling Program provides technical assistance to many communities. He indicated that ADEQ participates in Arizona Recycles Day, the 1-800 Cleanup Organization, and Treecycling outreach for schools. He indicated there are several existing material recovery facilities across the state, and identified some areas where populations could potentially support a material recovery facility such as, Pinal County, and the Prescott/Prescott Valley area.

Mr. Janke indicated that ADEQ tracks solid waste management data by gathering information such as, amount collected, amount generated, and amount recycled, from cities, towns and counties. He indicated that the general recycling rate for Arizona is 18 percent compared to the national average of 30 percent. He indicated that recycling rates vary in states, partly due to different states including different types of waste into their recycling category. He indicated that Arizona waste generation rates are higher than the national average, and this may be partly due to the Arizona twelve month growing season and the difficulty in tracking waste generated by winter visitors.

Candice Bell, Gila River Indian Community, inquired whether there was still a construction & demolition material recovery facility in Tucson.

Mr. Janke indicated he did not think the facility was still accepting construction & demolition waste, but it may still be diverting rubble from sand and gravel operations.

6. Valleywide Recycling Partnership Presentation

Mr. Henning indicated that agenda item number six was for information and discussion. He introduced Jacinda Denison, City of Avondale to speak on the Valleywide Recycling Partnership.

Ms. Denison indicated that the partnership was developed for individual jurisdictions to convey a common message on regional promotion of recycling. She indicated that the original members, Chandler, Gilbert, Glendale, Mesa, Phoenix, Tempe and Scottsdale, participated in the Vector Control Bag It & Tie It Campaign to combine education funds and inspection funds. She indicated that the partnership benefits its large and small members. For larger members, it allows the recycling message to reach a large part of their community. For smaller members, it allows funding to go a long way. She indicated that the partnership has expanded to 14 current members, and new members are welcome. She indicated that the partnership is currently using the “Recycle Guys” campaign to promote recycling. She indicated that more information on the project could be found on the website, www.recyclelevrp.com.

Chair Henning indicated that he would encourage those who are not currently members of the partnership to consider whether joining may be beneficial to their community.

7. City of Scottsdale Green Waste Pilot Program

Chair Henning indicated that agenda item number seven was for information and discussion. He introduced James Livingston, City of Scottsdale, to present on the Scottsdale Green Waste Pilot Program. Mr. Livingston indicated that the Scottsdale residents wanted a recycling opportunity for their green waste, but did not want another curbside barrel in addition to their trash and recycling barrels. He indicated that the City responded by initiating a curbside collection program for brush bulk item collection.

Mr. Livingston indicated that, on the first collection run, green waste from the residential brush bulk piles is collected and transported to the green waste processing area of the Salt River Landfill. He indicated that non-green waste bulk items are not collected on the first run, but drivers return on a second trip to collect and transport them to a separate area of the landfill. He indicated that, at the green waste area of the landfill, items that cannot go through the grinder (such as palm frawns) are sorted out and these reject materials are sent to a separate area of the landfill. He indicated that about 40 percent of the green waste collected is clean material that goes into the grinder for chipping. This material is piled high for addition of moisture and regular turning to produce mulch which is ultimately bagged and transported to local home and garden stores for sale.

Mr. Livingston indicated that the green waste program has been very positive with a collection of 6,725.91 tons of green waste collected and a significant portion diverted from the landfill from March 18, 2002 through January 31, 2003.

Ms. Denison inquired whether the pilot program served parts of the city or the whole city.

Mr. Livingston indicated that the program served the whole city.

Mr. Guminek inquired whether the green waste pilot program had impacted the City's bulk operations budget.

Mr. Livingston indicated that the program has slightly increased bulk operations costs, but is much less costly than the alternative of doubling staff to run separate programs for green waste and bulk waste. He indicated that the green waste program is not less costly than landfilling, but the City values the non-economic benefits of diverting significant amounts of waste from the landfill.

Ms. Denison inquired whether the tipping rate differs for green waste compared to bulk waste.

Mr. Livingston indicated that tipping rates for green waste are lower than for bulk waste because the green waste does not go to the landfill area and the Salt River Landfill gets paid for the mulch sent to home & garden stores.

Chair Henning inquired whether the City requests that residents separate the bulk waste from the green waste.

Mr. Livingston indicated that the City does make this request and that sometimes the residents separate, and sometimes they do not.

8. Presentation on Salt River Solid Waste Landfill and Material Recovery Facility

Mr. Henning indicated that agenda item number eight was for information and discussion. He introduced Randy Watkins, Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, to give an overview of the Salt River Landfill.

Mr. Watkins indicated that, over the last few years, the Salt River Landfill has developed recycling and green waste programs at the landfill site. He indicated that a large material recovery facility was recently constructed at the landfill. The new facility includes a recycling education room and, over the last year, about 900 people have participated in the facility tour. He indicated that he brought an educational recycling video which provides an overview of the facility and programs. He indicated that the video had won a communication award, and is available for use by communities who use the landfill.

The video showed that the Salt River Landfill is a state of the art 200 acre solid waste landfill and material recovery facility. The goal of the landfill is to recycle as much as possible and significantly reduce the volume of the rest. Waste brought to the landfill is processed in different ways, depending on its type. On the average, the landfill accepts about two thousand tons of waste each day for disposal, recycling or composting. The City of Scottsdale and the City of Mesa collect garbage, recyclables, green waste and bulk waste and transport it to the Salt River Landfill either directly or through a transfer station. The Town of Gilbert also transports solid waste collected in their residential program to the landfill. The landfill also has a white goods program for major appliances such as, refrigerators and water heaters.

The video showed that the landfill is designed to bury the garbage safely using the appropriate liner system, layering, drainage, leachate management, and pump system. Perforated pipes are used to

pump out rainwater or leachate in the refuse. The leachate is pumped from the base of the landfill to either a lined leachate evaporation pond or back into the landfill where it assists in the decomposition and compaction of the refuse. This allows saving of landfill space and allows the landfill to operate for many more years.

The video showed that careful monitoring of groundwater and methane gas is conducted during the process of landfilling and for years afterward. As methane gas is produced in the refuse, it is vacuumed out and sent to locations where it can be burned off or used as fuel. The green waste area is where green waste is sorted and chipped and processed into mulch. About 50,000 tons of green waste is diverted from the landfill each year. Landfill space is also saved through the thousands of tons of metal diverted each year through the white goods program.

The video showed that the largest volume of landfill space is saved by recycling materials like paper, plastic and glass through the material recovery facility. Another landfill project is the Alternative Energy Research Park, which includes an innovative electric generating plant which uses landfill gas from a closed and capped landfill instead of conventional fuel.

9. Call to the Public

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Solid Waste Advisory Committee. No comments were received and the meeting was adjourned.